1953

Are modern educational theories really new?

John P. Dufault
University of Massachusetts Amherst

ARE MODERN EDUCATIONAL THEORIES REALLY NEW?

DUFAULT - 1953

ARE MODERN EDUCATIONAL THEORIES REALLY NEW?

By

John P. Dufault

A problem presented in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Master of
Science Degree
University of Massachusetts
1953

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

THE INTRODUCTION

The Nature of History and of Education: The greater part of history has concerned itself with the broad political facts in the experience of large groups of people, of nations. The very expression "history" brings to the minds of most people a record of the political organization and activity of a nation, of the millions of people in that nation, through the centuries of time. The usual result is that people consider this record to be the complete story of the life of these people. Obviously, that sort of knowledge leaves out of the mind of the possessor many of the most important facts and truths concerning the nations and the people of the nations under consideration. Lacking some knowledge of how the people lived and of how they felt about certain things, the student of history cannot really understand many of the facts he may have read.

This fact has long been realized by historians. Recently, more and more attempts have been made to record things more intelligently and with better balance. Histories of education, as well as other histories, have been multiplied. In particular, the knowledge of the facts about education and some of the important factors connected with it, are being recognized as more and more important, not merely for the technical student of education, but for any

person who aims at being a cultured man. One cannot really understand the people of history without some knowledge of their aims and methods in education. One becomes more and more conscious of this as he progresses in study and experience in the field of education.

Different Attitudes Toward Education: All true educators carry on their work in accord with a certain attitude or philosophy of education and what education means. All men practically agree on the general meaning of education: It is the development of a human being in all his capacities. Yet, they may disagree intensely, to the point of being practically opposed to each other, about the ultimate aims that should guide that development, about the relative value of man's diverse capacities, about the proper ways and means of developing an individual, and so forth. Students of education are usually familiar with the names of such men as Erasmus, Descartes, Locke, Rousseau, Vives, Ascham, Comenius, Basedow, Mann, Dewey, Kilpatrick, and many others. Each one of these put forth his own theories of education in his own words, to contribute toward the history and the development of education through the centuries. All great men do this. This constant birth and passing of educational theorists and theories makes it necessary for the conscientious educator to continually increase his knowledge, and to reconsider his own theories carefully. This fact also makes the educator realize how important education really is to all peoples.

It makes him aware of the changing influences on education and of the ever-present importance of education to society.

Many questions are brought to the educator's mind as he studies the theories of other men. Many histories and many studies of individual theorists and their theories have been made by people inspired to this study by a former study of the history of education. These people continually work and find good and bad points in the theories of men of even the most distant past. Much agreement or opposition may be found between two famous and popular theorists, by such individual study.

Importance of Popular Belief and Feeling: It has long been known and agreed everywhere that education does not consist merely in formal schooling. The influence of the home, the government, the daily toil and play of men, upon the shaping of individuals, cannot be overlooked. These exert a great force in forming even the habits and the power of thought, to say nothing of their effects on bodily development and the training of character. But the particular forms of, for example, self-control, or keenness of thought, called for by the conditions of life in the Europe of the fifteenth or the eighteenth centuries, and in others, may well be different from those needed for successful living in the America of the twentieth century.

One is often led to wonder how much of the past, how many ideas and ideals stated by men of the past, still have

their effects on the society of today. In the study of education, especially, one finds statements or theories which still seem to be followed today. Many saying which are firmly implanted in our minds we know to be traceable to philosophers of the distant past -- such as the expression "One picture is worth a thousand words." Yet, even though it be agreed that such quotations as the preceding come from educational theorists -- educational philosophers -- it is many times impossible to agree on the true author of the statement -- again the case with the preceding quotation.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau and His Importance: One of the most familiar names in the field of education is that of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). The character of Rousseau has always been the subject of much discussion in education. This is in part probably due to the fact that Rousseau was a bundle of contradictions. Throughout his life his spirit was always that of a severe critic of all that men had done hitherto; his was the spirit of a reformer. Nevertheless, among all of his highly-disputed writings, his treatise on education, Emile, has probably had more effect on society than any other. It has always been, and will probably always be, considered one of the most important publications of an educational nature ever written.

In the midst of many probably unreasonable theories, brought forth by Rousseau in many of his writings, there is a wealth of good notions in detail, in Emile. Rousseau want-

ed to study the temperaments of children, and their attitudes, as a foundation for all education. He constantly emphasized the advantage of leading over driving, of example over precept. Furthermore, in attacking all educational conditions, Rousseau naturally upset many bad traditions, such as the appeal of vanity and envy as motives for studying (Book II), and sheer memorizing of statements not understood (Book III). Moreover, Rousseau did move men to fight for the equality of educational opportunity. Because of Emile, Rousseau has definitely made himself one of the most famous and important figures in education.[1]

Resemblance of Past and Present Theories: Many times, one reads a statement in a modern book of the philosophy of education, which strikes one as familiar -- as something he has already seen in another person's words long before. Such is often the case where Jean-Jacques Rousseau is concerned. Reading through modern books on educational philosophy, one often finds statements which remind him of ideas expressed by Rousseau in Emile. An actual comparison between some modern philosophy of education and that philosophy expressed by Rousseau in Emile, would be both an interesting and an informative study.

---

1 For a study of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, see Jacques Maritain's Three Reformers.

William Heard Kilpatrick and His Intentions: In order to make such a study, it would be necessary to compare a recent book on the philosophy of education with Rousseau's Emile. One of the most recent books on this subject is that of William Heard Kilpatrick, published in 1951. This book is both a comprehensive and an authoritative expression of philosophy. The author's aim in this book is best understood from the following paragraph, taken from the author's preface:

> "The effort herein made is to sum up in a statement the author's thinking in connection with his life work of teaching philosophy of education. While he was thus teaching, it seemed unwise to publish any such inclusive statement of position; the position itself was always in process of growth, and more, there was the danger that his students would be tempted to accept and give back what they found in his book rather than think creatively for themselves."[2]

Kilpatrick's experience in the field of education, and his high position in that field at the present time make him one of the most important modern theorists. For the purpose of this paper, Kilpatrick's book will serve as the statement of a strong modern philosophy of education.

---

[2] Kilpatrick, William Heard, Philosophy of Education, p. vii.

Intention of This Study: The purpose of this paper is to make a comparison between the theories of Kilpatrick and Rousseau on some aspects of education. The study is not intended to cover the entire field of education as considered by Rousseau and Kilpatrick in their books; that would be too great an undertaking. It will confine itself chiefly to an attempt at sketching a comparison between the two men from certain important factors considered by both in their philosophies. These factors will be considered under the following headings: The Nature of the Child; The Aims of Education; The Meaning of Learning; The Importance of Experience; The Necessity of Teacher Guidance; Conclusion, drawn from the comparison.

In these different chapters, there will quite certainly be some underdeveloped points and some omissions, due both to the limitations of knowledge and to defects of judgement. Effort will be made and consideration will be given to make the considerations well-balanced and the conclusions clear and true. It is sincerely hoped that this study will suggest further consideration and research in this or other closely-related directions.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF THE CHILD

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE OF THE CHILD

Rousseau: A Naturally Good Being Corrupted by Society:

"God makes all things good; man meddles with them and they become evil. He forces one soil to yeild the products of another, one tree to bear another's fruit. He confuses and confounds time, place, and natural conditions. He mutilates his dog, his horse, and his slave. He destroys and defaces all things; he loves all that is deformed and monstrous; he will have nothing as nature made it, not even man himself, who must learn his paces like a saddle-horse, and be shaped to his master's taste like the trees in his garden."[1]

This violent and emotional paragraph, the opening statement of Rousseau's Emile, immediately shows the reader how Rousseau felt about the results of traditional education on the individual. There is no doubt possible that, feeling the way he did, Rousseau had good reason to bring forth his new philosophy of education. His belief in the natural goodness of the human individual, corrupted by the influence of others on him, is further brought out by the statement: "Children's caprices are never the work of nature, but of bad discipline; they have either obeyed or given or-

---

[1] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Emile, Book I, pp. 17-18.

ders, and I have said again and again, they must do neither."[2]

Rousseau found the cause of the evil influences in man to be the fact that man lived in society, which here means "city life". Rousseau denounces society and social (city) living as harmful to an innate goodness and an innate potentiality of the human individual. This social existence, according to Rousseau, cannot help being corrupt, because of the great variety in the development of each individual. Complete natural development of all the capacities of each person would therefore be impossible because of the conflicting nature of other people trying to develop completely according to their own capacities and interests. Rousseau states this position very frankly when he says: "Men are not made to be crowded together in ant-hills, but scattered over the earth to till it. The more they are massed together, the more corrupt they become."[3]

These opinions concerning the child and his relationship to society are of considerable importance, because they provide the starting point for Rousseau's theories on education. This principle concerning the evil of social living is what makes him insist that the child should be taken

---

[2] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 212.

[3] Ibid. Book I, p. 72.

away from the corruption of society, as he says:

> "Tender, anxious mother, I appeal to you. You can remove this young tree from the highway and sheild it from the crushing force of social conventions. Tend and water it ere it dies. One day its fruit will reward your cares. From the onset, raise a wall around your child's soul; another may sketch the plan, but you alone should carry it into execution."[4]

Free from the harmful effects of society, the child will develop in mind and body according to his own impulses, interests, and desires -- and he will develop correctly and well -- Rousseau believes.

Dangers From Birth to Twelve Years of Age: Being thus separated from society, the child, progressing without external force or influence, other than that of environment, will begin to develop his faculties. Because of his beliefs concerning the nature of the child, Rousseau calls the period of early development a dangerous one:

> "The most dangerous period in human life is between birth and the age of twelve. It is the time when errors and vices spring up, while as yet there is no means to destroy them...."[5]

---

[4] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book I, pp. 18-19.

[5] Ibid. Book II, p. 147.

Rousseau continues, trying to prevent any evil from affecting the child:

> "...the mind should be left undisturbed until its faculties have been developed....Therefore the education of the earliest years should be merely negative. It consists, not in teaching virtue or truth, but in preserving the heart from vice and from the spirit of error."[6]

The realization of these ends would be impossible in the bustle of the city, and again because of his pure and impressionable nature, the child must be protected against society.

With all his insistence on keeping the child from any influence other than that of his own instincts, Rousseau makes an unexpected statement concerning the well-being of the child during his young development. He says:

> "Do you know the surest way to make your child miserable? Let him have everything he wants; for as his wants increase in proportion to the ease with which they are satisfied, you will be compelled, sooner or later, to refuse his demands, and this unlooked-for refusal will hurt him more than the lack of what he wants."[7]

Here there is a definite realization on the part of Rousseau

---

[6] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 147.

[7] Ibid.pp. 132-133.

that the child must be forbidden to have what he wants once in a while; he must not always get just what he wants, since, in later life, he will occasionally have to sacrifice his own wants for those of others.

The Nature of the Child's Mind: This consideration of the development of desires and interests brings up the question of the child's mind. According to Rousseau, "...as soon as his potential powers of mind begin to function, imagination, more powerful than all the rest, awakes, and precedes all the rest."[8] This is Rousseau's justification for saying that the mind should be left undisturbed until its faculties have been developed, else the imagination will compromise the development of these faculties by substituting imaginary ideas for the true concepts. This also led Rousseau to say:

> "Exercise his body, his limbs, his senses, but keep his mind idle as long as you can."[9]

This philosophy also led Rousseau to the amazing conclusion, regarding all human beings, that "...the more we know, the more mistakes we make; therefore ignorance is the only way to escape error. Form no judgements and you will never be mistaken."[10]

---

[8] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 116-117.

[9] Ibid. p. 148.

[10] Ibid. Book III, p. 406.

Thus, Rousseau considers the child as a naturally pure and good individual, who is constantly in the process of development. This development, if according to nature, simply follows the innate instincts of the child. True learning will not take place if there is any other influence than that of the child's natural and undisturbed environment. As the child's mind begins to develop in his younger years, his imagination grows and grows to such an extent that it suppresses and replaces the development of ability to think clearly and logically and to arrive at conclusions. It is necessary, then, to keep the child from much mental activity until his other faculties are well-developed. Then when his other faculties are properly developed, and he has the proper habits and attitudes, energy may be turned to the training of the child's mind -- his mental development. However, the child must occasionally face situations where he will not be able to do or to get what he wants, since this will surely be the case at times in later life. If this does not happen occasionally, the child will be terribly hurt when he expetiences his first frustration. This, according to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, is the nature of the child.

Kilpatrick: Child a Naturally Social Being: Turning now to a consideration of Kilpatrick's ideas on the nature of the child, one finds a somewhat different attitude toward the basic nature of the child. First and foremost, as opposed

to Rousseau, Kilpatrick does not believe that man can develop the right qualities and ideals, nor realize the fullest development of his capacities, unless he does so as a living, functioning cell in the organism of society. "To live well, man must live in society...man needs other humans in order to develop his full potentialities as man."[11] In this sense, man can only realize his proper place in the world insofar as he lives as a part of society. This society, by the joint development of its component parts -- the individual human beings -- develops itself in the manner and according to the pattern constructed by the individuals in it.

Kilpatrick insists further upon the necessity of considering the child as a social individual, when he says:

> "In these various ways, we have seen how the human individual is not sufficient to himself. To live in the true human sense, each one must live along with his fellows; and in any successful living, each one profits by what he gets from others. Man is inherently and inextricably social in nature...."[12]

There is no question that Kilpatrick most definitely feels that the individual could not develop properly human qualities without living with others, in society. Otherwise,

---

11 Kilpatrick, William Heard, Philosophy of Education, p. 45.

12 Ibid. p. 43.

such traits as generosity, understanding, deference for authority, etc., could not be developed, since alone, a child would have no occasion to practice such habits. This attitude of Kilpatrick is directly the opposite of that of Rousseau on this question. Just as Rousseau insists on hiding the child from life in society ("...raise a wall around your child's soul..."[13]), Kilpatrick insists just as strongly on the educational necessity of living in a social atmosphere. Kilpatrick's idea on this subject is even more evident when he says:

> "Thus does the life of man as man, in its distinction from the merely animal life, depend on the fact of selfhood achieved by the cooperation of others....Education must be a social process, on the procedural side, and it must aim to bring high-quality social living into effect."[14]

This attitude toward the child's relationship to social living colors all of Kilpatrick's statements throughout his philosophy.

Child's Character Complete With Education: Kilpatrick's aim in education seems to be toward the development of proper character, of a type to bring about well-integrated

---

[13] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book I, pp. 18-19.

[14] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 42.

social living. This leads to the question of what Kilpatrick considers good character to be. It is certain that Kilpatrick does not feel, as Rousseau did, that character is simply the effects of a naturally good instinct on the part of the child. On the contrary, the child develops his character as he lives, and has experiences, and finally achieves his character when he is an active, adult member in his place in society. The following paragraph shows Kilpatrick's opinion concerning character and its development:

> "Character is not, as some have thought, inborn; it is individually achieved. It is developed from the original equipment one has at birth. At the beginning, the infant is much like a sensitive plant, with little if any consciousness, no self-consciousness, and nothing properly to be called character. The first habit-formation may begin even before birth, and so on a relatively unconscious level. After birth, learnings slowly accumulate to form the beginning of an organization, out of which comes consciousness in a fuller sense. In time, especially as language begins, the 'self-other' process comes into operation, and from this develops self-consciousness. Now, the individual acts not only consciously, but self-consciously, aware both of what he does and that he is doing it. Out of this fact...come in turn accountability, responsibility, and conscience; so that prudence and morality have now

begun to function and grow."[15]

Necessity of Personal Choices: The preceding quotation is a sort of summary of the developmental nature of the child as considered by Kilpatrick. If this is the nature of the child as it grows and develops, just when does the child's mind become the central point in this process of character development, and how must it act? He himself actually works on his own character when he himself makes choices, according to Kilpatrick. As the latter says:

> "To build character, therefore, the individual must face many situations where he himself does the choosing. As long as someone else manages and directs him (essential as this may be at times), he is not himself choosing, he is not exercising constructive choice, and so he is not building proper character."[16]

Others may help the child and cooperate with him in gaining the goals he has set, if they are worthwhile. However, if he is to learn to subordinate present impulse and habit to broader and deeper good, he must see the broader good as the right thing to do; and accepting it, he must do it. Kilpatrick observes:

> "Present impulse and existing habits pull the individual in one direction; the broader pur-

---

15 Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 358.

16 Ibid. p. 360.

pose pulls in another direction, with the consequent demand for remaking the behavior pattern."[17]

It is the new behavior pattern which, followed again and again, becomes a habit, and thus, part of the person's character.

The question that now comes to the fore is that of what the child's nature should be in the face of different school situations. This could be restated as the question of what the child's nature is in the school. Kilpatrick feels that the children, if normal and natural, will affect each other more even than the teacher, as he points out:

"The pupils will immediately affect each other probably more effectively than will the teacher."[18]

The teacher then must make the school the place where there will be "many situations where the child can make choices of a kind to count toward moral character development."[19] The child isthus greatly influenced both by environment and by those who are in the process of development with him and like him. His naturally social character, so envisaged by Kilpatrick, makes this both important and normal.

Relationship of Theories of Kilpatrick and Rousseau: It is evident, then, that Kilpatrick does not agree with Rousseau

---

[17] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 360.

[18] Ibid. p. 367.

[19] Ibid.

on the real nature of the child, the basic nature for all development. Rousseau's child is a naturally good being, possessing an equally natural instinct to learn, an instinct which is frustrated and actually harmed, according to Rousseau, by anything but the child's own felt impulses. The only reason for having anyone around the child, for Rousseau, would be to answer his questions and to aid him in the accomplishment of his desires and the satisfaction of his needs. Kilpatrick, on the other hand, insists that the child can develop properly only as a member of a group. Since the child is naturally full of social tendencies, according to Kilpatrick, he could not develop properly unless allowed to interact with a group. The child's impulses are not naturally good and proper, according to this theory, and must be guided by the teacher into the development of proper habits.

The two men do not agree on the true and basic nature of the child. However, they do make many important observations concerning the proper way of developing the child, and no study of education would be complete without careful consideration of these theories concerning the child.

CHAPTER III

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER III

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

A Controversial Subject: This topic has always been controversial and spotted by many different theories. The individualists felt that the individual should be the starting point and the goal of all educational efforts, and that everything should be made secondary to the individual. The materialists felt that everything should be done with an eye to having as much power and possession as possible. The pragmatists felt that the individual and his everyday "present" success, happiness, and well-being should be the aims of education; that prestige and importance, knowledge and power, whatever these are considered to be by the present society, should be the means to the ends. Little thought is given to the future other than the insurance of comfort and happiness during that future.

Rousseau's Aim: Development of Natural Traits: Rousseau and Kilpatrick both reflect some of these theories in their own ideas concerning the aims and purposes of education. Rousseau's whole system, of course, is an expression of his aim in education -- the most perfect development of the individual from every point of view, by his own activity and experience. In many places in Emile, one may well question Rousseau's ideas and/or techniques; but in his own mind, Rousseau wanted to bring the individual, by the best methods possible (in his opinion), to the fullest realization of

all his capacities. Thus, Rousseau insists constantly upon allowing the child to follow his own impulses or desires in whatever situation he is placed. The aim is for the child to learn the right and wrong way of doing things, reacting to situations, and so forth, by seeing the results of his own action or reaction in a certain situation. If results are favorable from every point of view, says Rousseau, the child will react again and again in the same way in similar situations -- he will develop the proper habits and the proper dispositions, and thus develop the proper type of character.

As always with Rousseau, the attitudes and habits must not be forced upon the individual by someone else. If the individual is told or forced to do something, he is not developing his capacities to the fullest extent possible, since their development is limited by the authority or the force used on them. This is giving the child a great amount of freedom, and takes much more time and care than simply "explaining" something. But this very idea is practically the basis for Rousseau's theories, as he says:

> "There is only one man who gets his own way -- he who can get it single-handed; therefore freedom, not power, is the greatest good. That man is truly free who desires what he is able to perform and does what he desires. This is my fundamental maxim. Apply

it to children and all the rules of education will spring from it."[1]

Rousseau wanted the child left to make his own decisions, then, believing that he will recognize his own capacities and limitations, develop them the best he can, and live accordingly ("...desires what he is able to perform and does what he desires."). Interference from any authority would not allow this complete development, according to Rousseau, and the child's real character would be altered, since he would not be acting according to his own character, but according to that of someone else.

Rousseau's Ideas on Science: Since the sciences and scientific method have achieved such a high place in the modern set of educational aims, it would be well to note how Rousseau carries his theories over specifically to the field of science. He says:

"It is not your business to teach him the various sciences, but to give him a taste for them and methods of learning them when his taste is more mature."[2]

More and more educators are pointing out that sciences have too strong a place in high schools, where students are getting college level work when they are not actually ready for it. It would be well for the modern educator to keep

---

[1] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Emile, Book II, pp. 125-126.

[2] Ibid. Book III, p. 328.

Rousseau's suggestion in mind, and to give it strong consideration. If Rousseau were defending this point, he might add one of his pet maxims:

> "Beware lest you are carried away by the interest of your work, while the child is bored by it, but afraid to show it...."[3]

We must always protect ourselves from the idea that the student must adapt himself to what is being studied. Rather, we must adapt what is being studied to the student and to his needs and interests. "Present interest, that is the motive power, the only motive power that takes us far and safely."[4] When he wants to learn and when his interest is strong, we must do all we can to make it possible for him to do so and not to discourage him.

Rousseau's Ideal: The child, his fullest development, and his desires and interests, are all means as well as ends in Rousseau's plan of education.[5] Each experience is a mediate end in itself, since we use the means of setting up different situations to provoke this experience; and the naturally good, well-rounded, "whole" child is the end of the development. So Rousseau has many immediate aims or ends, which serve as a means to the final end-product, the per-

---

3 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book III, p. 368.

4 Ibid. Book II, p. 202.

5 Rousseau's desire to allow the child to learn and develop

fect individual (as perfect as his own capacities allow him to become), This is really an ideal rather than a possibility; nevertheless, that is Rousseau's goal.

Kilpatrick's Aim: Work With Higher Possibilities: In accord with what has already been seen about Kilpatrick, the aims and means of education, for him, are the development of an all-round character, character of a type which leads to proper behavior. This is easily understandable, since Kilpatrick has already said that learning must be understood in behavioral terms.[6] Actually, this means that one must make possible the peoper type of experience to lead to the habits and interests of a desired, proper type of citizen for our modern society.

Kilpatrick's aims are clearly suggested by his statement that the educator must take into account the whole per-

---

at his own rate and according to his own interest has many excellent points, but led him to some rather astounding and very dangerous statements. They are brought up here so that those who see them will not be led astray by them. The two statements are:"...do not attempt to give the innocent child the knowledge of good and evil since you cannot prevent the child learning by what he sees outside himself, restrict your own effort to impressing those examples on his mind that are best suited for him...."; and: "Let the child do nothing because he is told; nothing is good for him but what he recognizes as good." (Found in Book II,p. 154, and Book III, p. 343, respectively). These statements are dangerously false. If the child, young adult, or adult sees people living in debauchery and immorality, and seeming to enjoy it, he does not decide what is moral or immoral. Morality is a natural law which man disobeys because of a weakness in human nature, which every intelligent person recognizes, and to which every person is subject. This is only one example, but it shows the dangers and the erroneous philosophy in Rousseau's statements.

6 Kilpatrick, William Heard, Philosophy of Education, p. 226.

son and in particular must work for the higher possibilities of the learner.[7] Here, there is somewhat of a difference between Kilpatrick and Rousseau. Rousseau insists upon allowing full, complete, and free development of all that the child is prone to develop. Kilpatrick however, works with the "higher possibilities" of the child. As he later states:

> "There is, to be sure, a proper place for obedience and habits and skill, but primarily as servants of such higher traits as initiative, creativity, cooperation, and moral responsibility.... the effort here will be made to find a theory of learning which does not...use the child's present simply as a means to some distant future."[8]

Progression Toward Perfection: What Kilpatrick wants is to avoid disorganized development and preparation, in view of some really unforeseen goals. The idea is to develop the child so that he will be the best and do the best that he can at all times. And if his best today can be better tomorrow, that is what is desired. This is clear, when Kilpatrick says that "what is learned now will be used now to help remake the present living into a more effective living...a step further along in meaning and accordingly a

---

7 Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 236.

8 Ibid.

step higher in quality."[9] The goal of all this development by "present living" is the formation of an all-round character of the proper, neede type in modern society. In this way, the world would have good citizens at whatever state of life those citizens might be.

Forming Purposes -- Necessity of Personal Choice: If this progressive development towards perfection is to be our goal, it places certain necessities before the teacher, which Kilpatrick proposes as the means of achieving the well-rounded character which is the goal. Among these means is the purpose of the pupil. "To purpose and to realize one's purpose in a reasonable degree is to live as a free person."[10] One must give the child every oppurtunity and encouragement to form good purposes and to work because of and in view of those purposes. In order to help realize these purposes, one must make the acquisition of new learning available to the student by relating it with things that he already knows. Kilpatrick himself points this out when he says that "the more a new item is interrelated with matters already known, the easier and the stronger will be the resulting learning".[11]

This question of the forming of purposes by a free man makes us realize that it is necessary to know that the

---

9 Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 237.

10 Ibid. p. 248.

11 Ibid. p. 255.

experiences of an individual will lead him to form permanent attitudes. One must therefor insure the preparation of purposes that will lead to the fostering and development of proper, worthwhile attitudes. Kilpatrick's theory on this point is clearly expressed when he says:

> "The stronger the purpose the stronger are the resulting attitudes. As to direction, the purpose tends to build a favorable attitude toward any factor favorable to its cause, and an unfavorable attitude toward anything thwarting its cause."[12]

The only way these attitudes can be properly developed is when the individual himself chooses his path of action, or his reaction to a situation. So the situations must be carefully prepared so that the proper purposes and attitudes will be developed by the students. By carefully organizing the school situations, by being a living example to the students under his care, the teacher can aid in developing good character, by setting up situations for group interaction and development. As Kilpatrick says:

> "A regime of group purposes wisely and successfully initiated gives an opportunity for building respect for the personality of others."[13]

---

[12] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit p. 259.

[13] Ibid.

This shows one great difference between Kilpatrick and Rousseau. Rousseau cares for nothing but the single, individual child with whom he is working. Kilpatrick is thinking of society as a whole, and of the general welfare of all the students, not just that of one person.

If the individual is to develop his own character by living according to his own capacities and abilities to learn, then he must choose his own experiences. Otherwise, the child's development will necessarily be limited by the decisions of another person. Through his own best and most complete development, the child will improve the state of being of the whole group. Kilpatrick states:

> "What we wish is to cultivate critical study and independence of thought...."[14]

Further on, trying to clarify his ideas even more, Kilpatrick continues:

> "To build character (then) the individual must face situations where he himself does the choosing."[15]

Kilpatrick emphasizes this point even more, announcing that:

> "Freedom to purpose is essential to building of self-respect. Properly guided, it builds not only self-respect but also ability to choose wisely and to accept responsibility."[16]

---

14 Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 310.

15 Ibid. p. 360.

16 Ibid. p. 259.

In still another instance, one finds:

> "The educator (then) must have as a guiding aim to help build characters which will feel concern for worthy interests. For this is to enrich the life of the individual and through him, of the group."[17]

There is no question about the fact that the philosophy of Kilpatrick presupposes a very strong effort on the part of the teacher to gain as much knowledge as possible concerning the needs and interests, growth and development of the children. The only way one can help another is by knowing what is wrong with that person, or what that person wants or needs. To be a good teacher, under Kilpatrick's plan, one must have extensive training, and be able to guide the students to the proper experiences. Likewise, it is necessary to set up the proper situations, so that the students will make wise and proper choices.

> "(The) teacher's proper work is to help pupils so live that the living itself will call for, evoke, and include a fine quality of responses. Such responses, being felt, accepted, lived, will be built into character."[18]

That, clearly enough, shows the student the aim of education according to Kilpatrick.

---

[17] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 271.

[18] Ibid. p. 315.

Similarities and Differences Between Rousseau and Kilpatrick: Both Rousseau and Kilpatrick, then, have as their aims the fullest development of the character of the student -- the habits and skills of the child. Rousseau believes that the natural tendency of the child to develop properly must be observed and aided, but never directed by the teacher. Kilpatrick, however, is more specific: the teacher must work and plan to see that the higher possibilities of the child will be realized and developed into character which will be best for a member of modern society. The two men start from different premises, but basically, their intentions are the same.

CHAPTER IV

THE MEANING OF LEARNING

CHAPTER IV

THE MEANING OF LEARNING

Rousseau: Child Learns as He Lives: Rousseau's theory of learning is evident from the many things that we have already said about him and his ideas. He feels that man learns naturally as he lives, and as he has experiences. Rousseau does not say much about learning as such, but he does state over and over that man does learn by his experiences, by his reactions to different circumstances in which he finds himself. The fact that learning takes place naturally means, as far as Rousseau is concerned, that there must be no interference from outside the individual (other than the influence of the situation in which he finds himself), else the natural learning will no longer be able to progress naturally, because it will have been altered by the artifice of man.

Learning: An Instinct in Every Child: For Rousseau, the authoritarian or directive influence of anyone else on the individual is a very serious error. If the individual is not allowed to grow and to develop naturally, he will not be able to learn naturally, either. No one must try to "teach" the individual, else they will interfere with rather than help the education of the child.

> "It is instinct, rightly or wrongly educated, which makes the children skillful or clumsy, quick or

slow, wise or foolish."[1]

Learning, according to the preceding statement, is a natural instinct existing in every human being -- the "instinct to learn". According to Rousseau, this instinct must be followed, not frustrated from the exterior. When a well-trained dog sees a crumpled newspaper in his master's hand, instinct tells him to cower because punishment is imminent. When a child is faced by a certain situation, instinct to learn pushes him toward a certain reaction, Rousseau seems to feel. Directing this child in any way then would be frustrating nature.

Learning Harmed by Other Influences: When considering Rousseau's theory of learning, one must constantly keep the concept of experience in mind. Rousseau defends his theories by saying that the child cannot learn from books, cannot learn from the words of another. He again insists on experience as the only true means of learning, as he says:

> "...a child serves his apprenticeship in courage and endurance as well as in other virtues; but you cannot teach children these virtues by name alone; they must learn them unconsciously through experience."[2]

Further on, and insisting even more strongly on the fact that learning must come from experience and reality rather

---

[1] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Emile, Book II, p. 221.

[2] Ibid. p. 235.

than from another person, Rousseau states:

> "In any study whatsoever the symbols are of no value without the idea of the things signified. Yet the education of the child is confined to those symbols, while no one ever succeeds in making him understand the thing signified."3

Thus, according to Rousseau, learning is a completely natural process which is interfered with if man tries to explain things with either the oral or the written word, and without the actual object in question. A teacher is needed, that is admitted. What Rousseau means, however, is that the student can learn only if something "happens", but not if it is "told" or "written" to him, without any previous experience showing the evidence of this thing. By some modern standards, this would be considered rather farfetched, but nevertheless Rousseau's insistence on experience leads him logically to his conclusions concerning learning. One must remember that many of the modern tenets of psychology were not generally known nor considered important at Rousseau's time. He did, of course, realize that words at times are absolutely necessary, as he shows when he reluctantly says to "teach by doing whenever you can, and only fall back on words when doing is out of the question."4

---

3 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 185.

4 Ibid. Book III, p. 352.

Kilpatrick: Learning: Result of Behavior Development: According to Kilpatrick's theory, learning can only take place as long as the student is taking part in some activity in which he is particularly active. He must find himself in a certain situation, be aware of that situation, and react to that situation in whatever way he decides he should act. Thus, he will learn from his experience everything that is in the situation for him. It is only from the behavior of the individual in a certain situation that one can judge the amount and the type of learning that a person has had. Just as with Rousseau, learning implies experience and actual doing. However, Kilpatrick adds to this theory the idea that besides providing situations in which the individual can have the proper type of learning, one can judge the value of the situation and the reaction of the individual by the development of character in the individual, which is Kilpatrick's aim, according to Chapter III.[5]

This means that one can judge the learning by the behavior or change in the behavior of the individual after he has had a certain experience. Kilpatrick expresses this theory when he talks about the essential characteristics of education:

"Education must primarily seek character and be-

---

[5] See pp. 27-30 of this paper.

havior, all-round character of a kind to lead to proper behavior....

"Learning, the key constituent of education, must be understood in behavioral terms....

"In order for anything to be thus genuinely learned, that thing must first be lived; that is, it must enter functionally, in its own true character, into an actual life situation, a situation which the learner himself feels he is living.

"The concomitant learnings, especially as accumulated through successive experiences, must be taken fully into account in all guided or directed learning."[6]

There are even more definite statements about learning further on in Kilpatrick's book, where he says that "...behaving is typically an essential part of the learning process...learning goes forward best, if not solely, in a situation of concrete personal living....the first application of learning comes, normally, within the experience in which the learning takes place."[7]

Definition of Learning: This gives one an idea of when Kilpatrick feels that learning takes place. However, Kilpatrick has done more than just show situations in which learning takes place. He has gathered his thoughts together into one

---

6 Kilpatrick, William Heard, Philosophy of Education, p. 226.

7 Ibid. p. 338.

sentence, which may serve as a modern definition of learning:

> "Learning is the tendency of any part or phase of what one has lived so to remain with the learner as to come back pertinently into further experience."[8]

Learning in the modern sense, then, is not simply a question of reading and memorizing, no more than it was for Rousseau. It is much more than that -- the acquisition of something new and previously unpossessed, which develops the individual's personality and character with additional knowledge.

Thus one finds again a well-conceived, carefully-prepared idea from Jean-Jacques Rousseau, which, if put forth in the proper words, could well express the modern ideas of learning. With the exception of Rousseau's idea of a natural "instinct" to learn properly, one finds considerable similarity between Rousseau's ideas and the modern theories on learning. It is not surprising that Rousseau would express such ideas, because he starts from within the child to find out the truths and the necessities of education. It is not a question of adapting the child to a fixed method or curriculum, but rather of adapting the methods of education to the needs and interests of the child.

---

[8] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 239.

For this reason it is not hard to understand how Rousseau could have developed theories which prove valuable even at the present time. There is certainly an agreement between Rousseau and Kilpatrick on this subject of learning, and of how it can best take place. The great difference is that Rousseau called learning a natural instinct, while Kilpatrick envisages it as the process of permanent behavior change.

Similarities Between the Two Theorists: It is interesting to consider the fact that Rousseau was alone in breaking with traditional theories of education and learning when he brought forth his ideas. He thought carefully about children as he observed them, observing their needs and interests, and then he developed his theories. Kilpatrick on the other hand, has had many years of study and experience in the field of education, psychology, etc. Yet, the two men have put forth very definite and very similar ideas concerning the child and his learning. This is an indication, even to the most harsh critics of either man, that they most certainly try to work from and for the child, and that is why there are many definite similarities between the two theories.

CHAPTER V

THE IMPORTANCE OF EXPERIENCE

CHAPTER V

THE IMPORTANCE OF EXPERIENCE

One of the strongest and most constant plaints of modern educators is that students have too little occasion in school of facing real, true-to-life situations. One often sees evidence of poverty, the lack of facilities, and so forth, in different districts in the United States. These difficulties often place a great handicap on the teachers in those underdeveloped or underprivileged districts. With such difficulties and such lack of facilities, the questions arise in one's mind: How can students in such situations be motivated to the proper experiences which will give them the needed habits and interests for later life? How can teachers provide the needed education for our future citizens? In short, how will the students be able to learn, without enough blackboards, books, pictures, and so forth?

Rousseau: Experience the Prime Source of Learning: Although Jean-Jacques Rousseau was not concerned in particular with these situations existing today, his theories suggest some answers to these questions. In Emile , Rousseau not only suggests, but commands that the student's personal experience, be the prime source of his learning. Rousseau insists that the teacher should not be concerned with telling the student what should be done, or in giving him specific things to do. Rather, the student should be allowed to find himself in whatever situation arises, to learn all that he can from his

own reaction to that situation, and thus he would learn whether or not he should always act that way in such a situation as that. Thus the student would learn and develop habits by all the ramifications of his experience in a certain situation. In Emile, Rousseau states:

> "The real object of our study is man and his environment. To my mind those of us who can best endure the good and evil of life are best educated; hence it follows that true education consists less in precept than in practice. We begin to learn when we begin to live; our education begins with ourselves."[1]

It may be noted that neither here nor anywhere else is there mention of interaction and interdevelopment of one child by his association with others. Rousseau's plan of keeping the child away from all influences other than his own is kept throughout Emile.

The insistence of Rousseau on experience for true, proper learning is reiterated further on, when he says:

> "Experience precedes instruction."[2]

If the child is to be given any suggestions or advice, he must first have formed his own character and personality. To accent this point even more strongly, Rousseau again declares, much further on in Emile:

---

[1] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Emile, Book I, p. 30.

[2] Ibid. p. 79.

"Give your scholar no verbal lessons; he should be taught by experience alone; never punish him."[3]

This quotation may seem contradictory to the preceding one, since Rousseau says that experience precedes instruction, and then he says that the child should be taught by experience alone. However, it must be remembered that for Rousseau, anything told to the child should only be remark, answer to a question, or suggestion; never should it be direction, insistence, or personal explanation in the sense of a personal opinion of which one is trying to convince the child. Rousseau implies this when he says, as seen above: "Give your child no verbal lessons." Therefore, Rousseau does not contradict himself here; he is merely trying to insist more firmly on the theory that by his own experience alone can the child really learn properly.

Child Must Choose Own Experiences: One may well question how, if left to the influence of his own "instinct" and his personal impulses, the child can be expected to develop the habits and virtues of a good citizen in society. How can one be expected always to develop traits of cooperation, generosity, understanding of others' feelings, and so on, so necessary in community life later on? Rousseau passes this off quickly in the following quotation, already forwarded in a

---

3 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 144.

preceding chapter:

> "A child serves his apprenticeship in courage and endurance as well as in other virtues; but you cannot teach children these virtues by name alone; they must learn them unconsciously through experience."[4]

In answer to the questions at the beginning of this chapter, Rousseau would probably say, "The students, despite the lack of facilities, etc., can learn from experience." He would probably feel that with what few things they have, they could learn thrift and frugality, and how to get along with very little. Since he feels that everything is naturally ordained toward good, Rousseau might say, as he tries to show by the setting in Emile, that the children could learn everything they need and learn it well, from their surroundings, from nature.

Kilpatrick: Child Learns by Living: Turning again to the philosophy of Kilpatrick, one finds an insistence on experience as the vehicle of learning, almost as strongly as in the philosophy of Rousseau. The problem is not to have all kinds of facilities, but to make the proper use of what is available, to give students the experiences which will lead to the formation of traits of character which they will follow in later life. Kilpatrick points out:

---

[4] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 235.

> "...the child learns what he lives, <u>learns each response</u> as he sees it and feels it and <u>accepts</u> it to live by, and he learns this response <u>in the degree that he accepts it</u>."[5]

This means that students learn by their experiences -- not by having the teacher "explain" something, then practice doing what the teacher has said to do. In the modern sense of the word, "experience" means doing things, under certain circumstances, the way one feels that they should be done; by acting the way one decides to act.

<u>Liberty of Choice Essential</u>: This implies that the child must have the liberty of selecting what he will do, selecting his own experiences. Kilpatrick bears this out strongly, when he says:

> "To build character (then) the individual must face many situations where he himself does the choosing."[6]

Thus the child would experience the circumstances, experience what he does in those circumstances, and experience the effects of his actions in such circumstances. In this way, the child learns whatever he learns by the experience he has had.

<u>Experience in Real-Life Situations</u>: Since the child is pre-

---

[5] Kilpatrick, William Heard, <u>Philosophy of Education</u>, p. 265.

[6] <u>Ibid</u>. p. 360.

paring himself to live as a member of society in later life, his experiences must be of the sort to develop high-quality traits of character proper for living in that society. As Kilpatrick indicates, when discussing the learner:

> "...(The) learner must have many experiences in which he faces an actual life situation calling for such behavior on his part; the learner must feel in his heart that the situation calls for such behavior by him; feeling the call, he responds thus self-directively."[7]

The teacher must anticipate these needs of the children, and prepare and provide situations in which the students may react as they decide. Kilpatrick does not hesitate to make a very frank statement necessitating this provision of situations for experience, when he says:

> "...the school must be a place of living what is to be learned; for each one learns what he really and truly lives."[8]

Theory of Experience not New: One can well conclude that the modern idea that "Experience is the best teacher" is modern only because it continues to be important. It is by no means a "recent" (as opposed to "modern") idea, as is evident from a study of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Emile. It is interesting to note that in insisting upon this theory, Rousseau was

---

7 Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 296.

8 Ibid. p. 221.

breaking with the common ideas of his time. He was the most outspoken and most heard patron of such educational practice, and he was almost "notorious" because of the impact on the world of many of the theories in Emile. Nevertheless, it is most important to any study of the importance of personal experience in education and learning, to take into very careful consideration Jean-Jacques Rousseau's ideas on this subject.

CHAPTER VI

THE NECESSITY OF TEACHER GUIDANCE

CHAPTER VI

THE NECESSITY OF TEACHER GUIDANCE

Rousseau: Teacher Cannot be Otherwise: The concept of the type of guidance to be used to bring about the learning and the development of the proper knowledge and the proper traits of character or personality, was not foreign to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The eighteenth century philosopher based practically his entire theory concerning the role of the teacher, on the idea that the teacher, in his proper place, can be nothing but a guide, helping the student to go in the direction that he himself has chosen. Any other feeling toward the proper role of the teacher, or the "precepteur", would be impossible, since "Experience precedes instruction."[1] In other words, the child must learn by and of himself; all the teacher should do is to guide and help the child to have the proper types of experience.

It has already been pointed out how Rousseau feels about the nature of the child. The whole basis of his theories concerning education is the idea that the human baing is a being naturally ordained to what is right and good for him ("God makes all things good; man meddles with them and they become evil.")[2], and if there is anything wrong with that being as he lives his life, it is because of the fact

---

[1] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Emile, Book I, p. 79.

[2] Ibid. p. 17.

that he lives in society with others. In other words, Rousseau feels that human beings are born full of innate, natural goodness. Furthermore, as was previously brought out, Rousseau feels that as soon as man comes to life, he begins to learn.[3] According to part of that essentially good nature, Rousseau determined that man has, in himself, an "instinct" to learn good and proper habits.

Traditional Teaching Better Than None: Referring to traditional study under the ASRT -- Assign, Study, Recite, Test -- system, Rousseau insists that:

> "(Man) will have nothing as nature made it, not even man himself, who must learn his paces like a saddle-horse, and be shaped to his master's taste like the trees in his garden.
>
> "Yet things would be worse without this education, and man cannot be made by halves."[4]

Rousseau is, then, thoroughly convinced that the human being is as he should be and would remain so if left alone by man -- or better, by the teachers in traditional schools. He does, however, feel, as is evident above, that the individual would be even worse if he had had no teacher at all. Rousseau realizes that some good traits have probably been developed in

---

3 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book I, p. 30.

4 Ibid. p. 18.

man by the ordinary, traditional teacher; but of course, that teacher has also frustrated much other possibly good learning in the child. If the child were to lead himself and learn by his own desires and experiences, the necessary teacher implied by Rousseau ("...things would be worse without this education": a teacher of some kind is better than none at all) could only be a guide, a helper. This leads one to wonder just how rigidly Rousseau felt about the need for guidance as isolated from positive direction, and as it is understood here: subtle conduction to a situation for good, proper experience.

Even though the schools of Rousseau's time were set up according to the theory that students were to be directed, drilled -- "forced" -- to learn by the "maitres", nevertheless, Rousseau uses the very term "guidance", as understood here, in describing the teacher's role in education. True education, according to Rousseau, is definitely a:

> "...question of guidance rather than instruction. He (the teacher) must not give precepts, he must let the scholar find them out for himself."[5]

It is evident here that Rousseau was conscious of the need for guidance by the teacher. Moreover, Rousseau shows even more strongly that he was guidance-minded, and he defends

---

5 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. p. 54.

and promotes guidance when he says:

> "Children are incapable of judging, they have no true memory. They retain sounds, form, sensations, but rarely ideas, and still more rarely relations."[6]

If this is so, then it would be wrong for the teacher to try to explain something about which the child has no previous knowledge, or in which the child has no particular interest. The child would learn nothing from such teacher-direction, unless it were given in answer to a question asked by the child after some experience on his part. It would be wrong to tell the students the things they are supposed to learn or to make them do what the teacher says to do (by an order), according to Rousseau's ideas, since they would then not be following their own impulses ("instincts"), but those of the teacher.

Teacher's Role of Guidance: Situations for Choice: The question arises now as to what exactly would be the teacher's role under these theories of guidance brought forth by Rousseau. The teacher may and must set up the proper situations for learning, situations in which the students will learn by their own choice of activity, by their own experiences. Rousseau points this out clearly, when he says to the teacher:

> "In the first place, do not forget that it is rare-

---

[6] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 181.

> ly your business to suggest what he ought to learn; it is for him to want to learn, to seek and find it. You should put it within his reach, you should skillfully awaken the desire and supply the means for its satisfaction."[7]

It is clear that Rousseau implies, or even states implicitly, that it is the teacher's job to guide the child to situations, but to let him (the child) make his own choice as to what he shall do.

As was stated previously, Rousseau does feel that a teacher <u>is</u> necessary to the student, and that at rare times, the teacher may ask guiding questions to awaken the child's interest and desire to learn. If such questions are used, they awaken the interest of the child so that he begins to ask questions; the teacher must be careful not to lead the child away from his own conclusions. This is proposed by Rousseau as he continues:

> "So your questions should be few and well-chosen ...(and)...as soon as you cannot give him a suitable explanation, give him none at all."[8]

There can certainly be no doubt that Rousseau was very conscious of the need for and the importance of good teacher guidance.

---

[7] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit., Book III, p. 346.

[8] <u>Ibid</u>.

Kilpatrick: Teacher Sets up Situations: In the previous chapter, insisting upon the importance of experience, Kilpatrick was just as insistent as Rousseau -- if not more-so -- on the fact that experience must be by personal choice. That is, if the child is to do a certain thing in a certain situation, it must always be a situation "where he himself does the choosing."[9] It was pointed out by Kilpatrick that for the child to really learn, the child must make his own choices. Kilpatrick has also pointed out on several occasions that one must work with the higher possibilities of the learner; one must try to lead the child to the development of habits which are desirable and proper for a good citizen in modern society.

Such insistence upon training the child properly for citizenship in society, by giving him chances to do things by his own choice, makes very definite qualifications necessary on the part of the teacher working with the child. Kilpatrick suggests:

> "If we wish pupils to grow in intelligent self-determination, then their school living must include both the possibility and encouragement of intelligent self-determination."[10]

The teacher must be the one to set up good situations in

---

9 Kilpatrick, William Heard, Philosophy of Education, p. 360.

10 Ibid. p. 221.

which the students may exercise this self-determination. The teacher must be able to guide the students properly so that they may, by their own decisions, react in their own way. As Kilpatrick explains:

> "We must leave, under guidance, as much self-direction to the group as they can manage."[11]

Again, guidance is important. If the students are to be able to take responsibility, they must have the abilities to do so; and the teacher must guide them to the proper development of these abilities.

If the teacher guides the student properly to the development of high-quality traits of character, such as the ability to take responsibility, they will develop the traits of cooperation, good judgement, intelligent self-determination. For, as Kilpatrick says:

> "...the more a new item is interrelated with matters already known, the easier and stronger is the resulting learning."[12]

This is just as true for things which have to do with knowledge as it is true for the development of personality. Arguing further against the use of teacher judgements in the place of student self-determination, Kilpatrick adds:

> "As a rule coercion (threat of punishment), es-

---

[11] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit p. 221.

[12] Ibid. p. 255.

pecially with the young, cuts off rather than increases favorable internal urge and so is a poor means of effecting learning."[13]

This leads to the conclusion that there is even more important reason for careful teacher guidance -- to lead the students away from bad habit-formation.

Teacher's Role That of Guidance: It is not hard to see, with his attitude toward the child and what is the best way for the child to learn, how Kilpatrick could have said:

> "The teacher's task becomes...primarily that of guidance....It is what pupils do of themselves that brings the best learning results."[14]

In still another remark, Kilpatrick seems to reiterate this and his previous statements, when he says, rather comprehensively:

> "(The) teacher's proper work is to help pupils so live that the living itself will call for, evoke, and include a fine quality of responses. Such responses, being felt, accepted, lived, will be built into character."[15]

This, Kilpatrick showed in Chapter III, is the aim of education; and if the pupils learn best by their own selection and activity, the teacher's work can only be that of careful guidance.

---

[13] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 267.

[14] Ibid. p. 307.

[15] Ibid. p. 315.

In order to be able to do such things properly, the teacher must know his students, know them very well, know their feelings and their attitudes. Therefore, as Kilpatrick says:

> "...the practice of keeping a teacher with a given class only one year may well be questioned."[16]

In one year, a teacher is barely able to get to know half of the students in a large class; so the wisdom behind Kilpatrick's statement is evident. He emphasizes the importance of the teacher's role even more when he points out:

> "The teacher in guiding the day-by-day growth of those under his care looks thus immediately to present living, mediately toward the intervening process, and remotely to adult life. The intervening process must be the kind to grow step-by-step into the desired kind of adult living."[17]

This "intervening process" is the development brought about by careful teacher guidance of the students to wholesome and worthwhile experiences, and consequent strong and worthwhile learning. These experiences and this learning, if in keeping with the philosophy put forth by Kilpatrick in the above and other equally important statements, will develop gradually a character made up of ideal habits for society.

---

[16] Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 337.

[17] Ibid. p. 324.

Comparison Between Two Statements: There is no doubt about the fact that Jean-Jacques Rousseau definitely proposes the need for guidance on the part of the teacher, rather than authoritarian direction. There is likewise no question on the fact that there is great similarity between the theories set forth by Rousseau and those set forth by Kilpatrick, concerning the right relationships between teachers and students. This fact is brought out not only by the previous citations, but even more clearly by the following statements. They are presented together because of the similarity of basic thought, showing the real meaning of guidance as opposed to authoritarianism:

Rousseau:	Kilpatrick:
"...let him think he is always master while you are really master. There is no subjection so complete as that which preserves the forms of freedom; it is thus that the will itself is taken captive."[18]	"If a proper educational atmosphere has been built, pupils should be accustomed to speak freely and feel both openness to teacher suggestions and values and at the same time the full conviction that the teacher will not dogmatically insist in his own point of view."[19]

---

18 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, op. cit. Book II, p. 210.

19 Kilpatrick, William Heard, op. cit. p. 316.

There is very definitely, therefore, a strong insistence on the necessity of teacher guidance, on the parts of both Rousseau and Kilpatrick. Likwwise, their attitudes are very similar concerning the way in which guidance should be carried out. So once again, one finds Rousseau standing out in the eighteenth century, as he breaks away from tradition to try to reform and redirect educational practices. He also stands out because the spirit of what he tried to do is still in effect today, nearly two centuries after he brought his theories before the world.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Review of Two Theories: It would be wrong to assume that there is no difference between the educational theories of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and those of William Heard Kilpatrick. True, there are many similarities between the theories of the two men; that has been shown by the comparisons made in this study. However, one must always keep in mind the fact that Rousseau and Kilpatrick do not agree on the basic, original nature of the child. The fact that the two men arrive at similar conclusions many times is not merely coincidental. They both work logically from their first principles. The difference lies in the fact that Rousseau felt that the human being was a creature naturally ordained to what was good for him, with a natural instinct to learn properly the things which were good for him, a natural tendency toward his own education. Kilpatrick, on the other hand, bases his theories on the modern psychological knowledge concerning the growth and development of the human individual.

Proceeding carefully each from his own idea of the original nature of the child, the two men found several common ideas on the aims of education, which may be seen implicitly and/or explicitly in their writings. Both are working, it is true, for the fullest possible development of the character of the child. However, Rousseau believed that the child should be just left to live according to his own de-

sires and impulses, without any influence whatsoever, other than that of his own "instincts". Kilpatrick aims at character formation, also, but by very careful study and understanding of all the psychological factors which could enter into this development. Proceeding in these different manners, the two men seem to find many similar conclusions and to make many similar statements, and thus show some basic likenesses in their aims for education.

In the study of experience and its importance in education, one again finds common ideas, which are again arrived at by different means. Rousseau insists upon experience because without it the child would be depending on someone else for what he is to learn, and would not be following his <u>own</u> natural instinct. Kilpatrick, too, insists upon experience, because together with all the psychologically-proven methods of teaching, experience and personal activity insure the most permanent learning, as shown by psychological research.

With their theories concerning the impossibility of strong, permanent learning without experience, the two men naturally turn to the role of the teacher in such a system of education, and to the necessity of guidance by the teacher. Rousseau seems to insist on this because he feels that a teacher is necessary, but a teacher who is anything else but a guide and helper would not be in accord with his theory of learning. Kilpatrick's insistence upon guidance im-

plies that a teacher must be well-prepared in all aspects of education, especially in the knowledge of child growth, development, and behavior patterns. Knowing this, the teacher should be able to predict and prepare for the needs of the children by setting up proper situations for learning, according to the children's interests.

Continued Importance of Common Ideas: One of the most interesting things that come to the fore because of this study is the fact that Rousseau did say or imply many things which we consider important in education today. The fact that he was breaking so completely with the traditional theories of his time is likewise a very interesting point. Rousseau had none of the extensive training, nor the deep knowledge of the psychological bases for many factors in education, especially concerning behavior, that does Kilpatrick. Yet, Rousseau still found many right answers, many important ideas concerning proper ways to work with children. The important point is that both men are determined to adapt the education to the child, not mold the child to a set formula of education.

This last point is one of the most important observations made possible by this whole study. The importance of this need of working with the child instead of on him, may be guessed from the strong arguments given in its favor by Kilpatrick. Nearly two hundred years ago, Rousseau was intelligent enough to realize this need, even though his

original emphasis on complete freedom of development, with no outside interference whatever, may be manifestly erroneous. It is remarkable that after such insistence on leaving the child to his own impulses the eighteenth century critic and reformer could have come to the idea that education must be of such a sort as this. It would be more believable if Rousseau had insisted that there should be no work with the student at all.

Nature and Limitations of This Study: This study is by no means an exhaustive one -- neither was it meant to be so. It was meant only to compare the theories of Rousseau and Kilpatrick on some important points to note the relationship between modern education and the theories of Rousseau. Many modern ideas had seemed familiar to the author, and this study has shown that many of these modern theories are not really new; they are modern because they continue to be important, and they need reaffirmation every so often to make people realize how important they really are.

There are probably many more points on which Rousseau and Kilpatrick agree or disagree. However, if there remained no questions to be answered, no problems to be faced, education would be ideal -- that which is impossible in the finite lives of men. It is only hoped that this study has proved or will prove of some value to others than the author, showing as it does some of the likenesses and differences between the ideas of two great and important men in education.

The study has shown the author that theories known and followed today in education are not always nor necessarily new; they may be the modern discovery of the answers to problems that existed in great minds of a history far removed, but never forgotten. The study has been more than worthwhile to the author, having proven the fact that many of the concepts of today are, actually, concepts that were shown to the world long ago, but were not heeded nor thought important. If this information in this paper can stimulate others to studies of their own on certain problems, this work has been much more than worth the effort put into it. The problem undertaken to be solved in this paper --Are Modern Educational Theories Really New? -- has been answered; but probably many more questions have been brought up by this study, which will be answered later by others. If so, then this work has proven of definite value to the author and to those who read it.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

The following is a list of the quotations taken from Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Emile in the original form, and the pages in this paper where different parts of the different quotations may be found in English.

Emile, Book I, pp. 17-18:

"Tout est bien, sortant des mains de l'Auteur des choses, tout degenere entre les mains de l'homme. Il force une terre a nourrir les productions d'une autre, un arbre a porter les fruits d'un autre; il mele et confond les climats, les elemens, les saisons; il mutile son chien, son cheval, son esclave; il bouleverse tout, il defigure tout; il aime la difformite, les monstres; il ne veut rien tel que l'a fait la nature, pas meme l'homme; il le faut dresser pour lui, comme un cheval de manege; il le faut contourner a sa mode, comme un arbre de son jardin.

"Sans cela, tout iroit plus mal encore, et notre espece ne veut pas etre faconnee a demi."

In this paper: pp. 10, 51, 52.

Emile, Book I, pp. 18-19:

"C'est a toi que je m'adresse, tendre et prevoyante mere, qui sus t'ecarter de la grande route, et garantir l'arbrisseau naissant du choc des opinions humaines! Cultive, arrose la jeune plante avant qu'elle meure; ses fruits feront un jour tes delices. Forme de bonne heure une enceinte autour

de l'ame de ton enfant; un autre en peut marquer le circuit, mais toi seule y dois poser la barriere."
In this paper: pp. 12, 17.

Emile, Book I, p. 30:

"Notre veritable etude est celle de la condition humaine. Celle d'entre nous qui sait le mieux supporter les biens et les maux de cette vie est a mon gre le mieux eleve; d'ou il suit que la veritable education consiste moins en preceptes qu'en exercices. Nous commencons a nous instruire en commencant a vivre; notre education commence avec nous; notre premier precepteur est notre nourrice."
In this paper: pp. 44, 52.

Emile, Book I, p. 54:

"...il s'agit moins pour lui d'instruire que de conduire. Il ne doit point donner de preceptes; il doit les faire trouver."
In this paper: p. 53.

Emile, Book I, p. 72:

"Les hommes ne sont pas faits pour etre entasses en fourmilieres, mais epars sur la terre qu'ils doivent cultiver. Plus ils se rassemblent, plus ils se corrompent."
In this paper: p. 11.

Emile, Book I, p. 79:

"L'experience previent les lecons;...."

In this paper: pp. 44, 51.

Emile, Book II, pp. 116-117:

"Sitot que ses facûltes virtuelles se mettent en action, l'imagination, la plus active de toutes, s'eveille et les devance."

In this paper: p. 14.

Emile, Book II, pp. 125-126:

"L'homme vraiment libre ne veut que ce qu'il peut, et fait ce qu'il lui plait. Voila ma maxime fondamentale. Il ne s'agit que de l'appliquer a l'enfance, et toutes les regles de l'education vont en decouler."

In this paper: pp. 24-25.

Emile, Book II, p. 144:

"Ne donnez a votre eleve aucune espece de lecon verbale; il n'en doit recevoir que de l'experience: ne lui infligez aucune espece de chatiment;...."

In this paper: p. 45.

Emile, Book II, p. 147:

"Le plus dangereux intervalle de la vie humaine est celui de la naissance a l'age de douze ans. C'est le temps

cu germent les erreurs et les vices, sans qu'on ait encore aucun instrument pour les detruire;....Il faudrait qu'ils ne fissent de leur ame jusqu'a ce qu'elle eut toutes ses facultes:....La premiere education doit donc etre purement negative. Elle consiste, non point a enseigner la vertu ni la verite, mais a garantir le coeur du vice et de l'esprit de l'erreur."

In this paper: pp. 12-13.

Emile, Book II, p. 148:

"Exercez son corps, ses organes, ses sens, ses forces, mais tenez son ame oisive aussi longtemps qu'il se pourra."

In this paper: p. 14.

Emile, Book II, p. 181:

"Je dis donc que les enfans, n'etant pas capables de jugement, n'ont point de veritable memoire. Ils retiennent des sons, des figures, des sensations, rarement des idees, plus rarement leurs liaisons."

In this paper: p. 54.

Emile, Book II, p. 185:

"En quelque etude que ce puisse etre, sans l'idée des choses representees, les signes representans ne sont

rien. On borne pourtant toujours l'enfant a ces signes, sans jamais pouvoir lui faire comprendre aucune des choses qu'ils representent."
Use in this paper: p. 37.

Emile, Book II, p. 202:

" L'interet present, voila le grand mobile, le seul qui mene surement et loin."
Use in this paper: p. 26.

Emile, Book II, p. 210:

" ...qu'il croie toujours etre le maitre, et que ce soit toujours vous qui le soyez. Il n'y a point d'assujetissement si parfaite que celui qui garde l'apparence de la liberte; on captive ainsi la volonte meme."
Use in this paper: p. 60.

Emile, Book II, p. 212:

" Le caprice des enfants n'est jamais l'ouvrage de la nature, mais d'une mauvaise discipline: c'est qu'ils ont obei ou commande; et j'ai dit cent fois qu'il ne falloit ni l'un ni l'autre."
Use in this paper: p. 10.

Emile, Book II, p. 221:

" Cette disposition, bien ou mal cultivee, est ce qui rend les enfants adroits ou lourds, pesans ou dispos, etourdis ou prudents."

Use in this paper: pp. 35-36.

Emile, Book II, p. 235:

" La constance et la fermete sont, ainsi que les autres vertus, des apprentissages de l'enfance: mais ce n'est pas en apprenant leurs noms aux enfans qu'on les leurs enseigne, c'est en leur faisant gouter, sans qu'ils sachent ce que c'est."

Use in this paper: pp. 36, 46.

Emile, Book III, p. 328:

" Il ne s'agit point de lui enseigner les sciences, mais de lui donner du gout pour les aimer et des methodes pour les apprendre, quand ce gout sera mieux developpe."

Use in this paper: p. 25.

Emile, Book III, pp. 346-347:

" Premierement, songez bien que c'est rarement a vous de lui proposer ce qu'il doit apprendre; c'est a lui de le desirer, de le chercher, de le trouver; a vous de le mettre a sa portee, de faire naitre adroitement

ce desir de lui fournir les moyens de le satisfaire; il suit de la que vos questions doivent etre peu frequentes, mais bien choisies;..., sitot que vous n'avez pas a lui donner sur ce que vous lui dites un eclaircissement qui soit bon pour lui, ne lui en donnez point du tout."
In this paper: pp. 55, 56.

Emile, Book III, p. 352:

"Il faut parler tant qu'on peut par les actions, et ne dire que ce qu'on ne sauroit faire."
In this paper: p. 37.

Emile, Book III, p. 368:

"...gardez, quand l'amusement du travail bous emporte, que lui cependant ne s'ennuie sans vous l'oser temoigner."
In this paper: p. 26.

Emile, Book III, p. 406:

"Puisque plus les hommes savent, plus ils se trompent, le seul moyen d'eviter l'erreur est l'ignorance. Ne jugez point, vous ne vous abuserez jamais."
In this paper p. 14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Foxley, Barbara, M. A., Emile or Education, By Jean-Jacques Rousseau, E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1911, pp. vii + 444. - Translation.

Kilpatrick, William Heard, Philosophy of Education, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1951, pp. 33 + 385.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, "Emile", Oeuvres de Jean-Jacques Rousseau, A Paris, Chez Lefevre, Libraire, de l'Imprimerie de Crapelet, Tomes 8 et 9, 1820.

Approved by:

William M. Bourko

Albert W. Pusins

(Problem Committee)

Date June, 1953